

#3
08/10/01

2167

RECEIVED

AUG 09 2001

Group 2100

Applicant: Stanley Mo, et al. § Group Art Unit: 2167
Serial No.: 09/540,968 §
Filed: March 31, 2000 §
For: MANAGING ON-LINE §
TRANSACTIONS § Atty. Dkt. No.: INTL-0365-US

Commissioner for Patents
Washington DC 20231

RESPONSE TO PAPER NO. 2

Sir:

In response to the office action mailed on May 23, 2001, reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks:

Remarks

Claim 1 calls for receiving a dedicated inventory allocation, completing a plurality of on-line transactions against the allocation and requesting additional dedicated inventory allocation.

Feigin, according to the Examiner, shows a "general inventory handling system." As the Examiner points out, Feigin does not complete a plurality of on-line transactions against a dedicated inventory allocation.

The patent law does not provide for an obviousness per se rejection. To the contrary, the United States uses an objective system. Under this objective system, the Examiner must show, from a reference, that the invention would be obvious. To the extent the Examiner tends to rely on well known prior art, which is not believed to be the case here, the Examiner is called

Date of Deposit: 8/3/01
I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as **first class mail** with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Washington DC 20231.
Lisa O'Sullivan